

REMARKS

The examiner objects to the drawings because according to the examiner “the main bus in Fig. 3 is identified by element number 102 instead of 12, as on page 1 of the specification.” The drawing of Figure 3 has the main bus identified by element number 12 and is consistent with the specification. As such the examiners objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

The examiner initially rejects claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, and 10-12 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Lui (5337413). The examiner admits in his 103(a) rejection that Lui does not disclose bus idle detection circuitry in the bus repeater. As amended, independent claim 1 has the limitation of bus idle detection circuitry in the bus repeater and as such claim 1 and all of its dependent claims are not anticipated by Lui.

The examiner additionally rejects claim 10 by stating that the limitation of “at least one of the bus repeater and the remote terminal is a programmable device” is described by Lui. The portion of Lui cited to (Col. 5 lines 20-47) refers to “a control program running on the host...” While this does show a programmable component, the examiners argument relies on the host being analogous to either the bus repeater or the remote terminal of claim 10. In the examiner’s 102(b) rejections to claims 1, 2, and 8 the examiner states that “Lui discloses a communication system ... that forms a link between a main bus 2 connected to host 1 (*central computer*) and extended bus 2 connected to remote devices 13...” In this statement the examiner makes it clear that he is considering the host of Lui to be equal to the central computer of the present application. Because of this the section cited to by the examiner discloses only that the central computer contains a programmable portion and does not disclose having the bus repeater or the remote terminal being programmable. Since Lui does not disclose claim 10 and claim 8 has been amended to include the language of claim 10, claim 8 is allowable over Lui, as are all of its dependent claims.

Since independent claims 1 and 8 are not anticipated by Lui, neither are dependent claims 2, 4-6, and 10-12. As such, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, and 10-12 as amended are allowable over Lui under 35 USC 102(b).

The examiner additionally rejects claims 1-6, 8-12, 14, and 15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over what he calls “Admitted Prior Art” in view of Lui. As amended, independent claim 1 requires a bus idle detection circuit in the bus repeater. Since neither the

“Admitted Prior Art” nor Lui describe this feature the combination of them cannot be said to disclose this limitation. As such, independent claim 1 is patentable over “Admitted Prior Art” in view of Lui. Since Independent claim 1 is allowable, so are its dependent claims 2-6.

In his 103(a) rejection of claim 10 using “Admitted Prior Art” in view of Lui, the examiner relies on the same argument as his 102(b) argument to attempt to show Lui disclosing at least one of the bus repeater and the remote terminal being a programmable device. Claim 8 has been amended to include the language of claim 10. As discussed above Lui does not disclose this capability and the examiner has cited nothing to show that “Admitted Prior Art” discloses this capability. As such Lui in view of “Admitted Prior Art” cannot be said to encompass this capability, and therefore claim 8 is allowable over Lui in view of Admitted Prior Art.

The examiner finally rejects claims 7 and 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lui in view of Alexander (6701402). Claim 7 has been canceled, however claim 1 has been amended to contain the language of claims 7 and 13. The examiner rejected claims 7 and 13 because “Alexander discloses logic circuitry for detecting when the bus is idle.” While Alexander does disclose circuitry for detecting when a bus is idle based on a plurality of second signals it does not disclose containing the logic circuitry within a bus repeater as was required by claims 7 and 13, and is now required by claim 1. Additionally it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a bus idle detection circuit within the bus repeater. Alexander describes bus idle detection circuitry, and also describes it as being associated with the controller and not the repeater. Since both of “Admitted prior art” and Lui have separate controller and bus repeater components the teaching of Alexander would suggest putting the bus idle repeater in the controller logic and *not* in the bus repeater as is disclosed by amended claim 1. (See Col. 1 Lines 52-55, associating the circuit containing the bus idle detector with the control logic and not with the repeater.)

Since the combination of Alexander and Lui does not disclose the claimed element of a bus idle detection circuit *in the bus repeater* claim 1, along with its dependent claims 2-7, is allowable over the combination of Lui and Alexander under 35 USC 103(a).

Thus claims 1-6, 8, 9, and 11-15 are in condition for allowance. Claims 7 and 10 have been canceled. No additional fees are seen to be required. If any additional fees are due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge deposit account No. 50-1482, in the name of

Carlson, Gaskey, and Olds, P.C. for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment. Therefore, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Theodore W. Olds/

Theodore W. Olds, Reg. No. 33,080
Carlson, Gaskey & Olds
400 W. Maple Road, Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: December 4, 2007